

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/559,915	12/07/2005	Jacobus Josephus Maria Ruigrok	NL030681US1	9555	
24738 PHILIPS INTE	7590 11/01/201 ELLECTUAL PROPER	EXAMINER			
PO BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510-8001			LOUIE, MANDY C		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1715		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/01/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/559,915	RUIGROK ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
MANDY C. LOUIE	1715		

-						
	MANDY C. LOUIE	1715				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence ado	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 13 October 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.				
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, with 37 CFR 41.31; o	vhich places the r (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing						
b) Mean The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. I no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checket. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee to action; or (2) as			
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp.	liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be t	filed within two month	s of the date of			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
AMENDMENTS	ann are anne period del lorar in er	51 11 4 1.07 (u).				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will <u>not</u> be entered be	cause			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		E below);				
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet 		lucing or simplifying t	he issues for			
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a ∈	corresponding number of finally reis	octed claims				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (PTOI -324)			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)						
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendme	nt canceling the			
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided. 		be entered and an e	xplanation of			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3-8, 10-12, 16-19.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to compare the compared to the comp	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a			
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowar	ce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
13. Other:						
/Timothy H Meeks/	/M. C. L./					
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1715	Examiner, Art Unit 1715					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Regarding arguments on pg 8 of remarks (filed on 10/13/10) drawn to overfy broad interpretation of "different," it is refuted that since the specification does not define different physical processes, it will be given it is broadest reasonable interpretation. Although the applicants points to the specification for examples of different physical processes, the claims are not limited to examples in the specification. Though, it is suggested by the examiner that the claims perhaps be amended to rectice such limitations.

Regarding arguments on page 10 of remarks drawn to Shappir teaching voltage pulses and not current pulses and references to para 00/29-0030, it is pointed out that Shappir teaches the pulses affects the electrical, physical or mechanical properties, wherein thereshold voltage is an example of these properties being affect by the pulses [00/29-0030]. It does not appear that Shappir teaches using voltage pulses. In addition, applicant's arguments of Shappir teaching only one physical process, it is noted that Shappir examplifies magnetization vectors, but it is not limited to only magnetization, so one of ordinary skill in the art would glean that Shappir is capable of modifying a plurality of physical process.

Regarding arguments on page 12 of remarks drawn to Gill failing to teach an current is applied to heat the magnetic layer structure while the magnetic field is applied to the at least one bias layer and is referenced to col 4, in 22-29, col 3 ln 45-56; it is refuted that Gill does in fact teach applying a current to a magnetic layer while appling a magnetic field as indicated in col 4, in 4-10. Hence, argument is moot.

As as addressed above, the submitted arguments were deemed unpersuasive, and hence, the same rejections have been maintained.

Applicant's amendment to cancel claim 13 will be entered since such amendment does not change the scope of the pending claims.